7:Columbia U. S-4, 5 1956 RH: Caucasia
RH1

HUMAN GEOGRAPHY

Distribution of Settlements

172 The primary inhabitants of the Caucasus, the Caucasians proper, are ancient. They have been there since time immemorial, and the Caucasus was known to the peoples of the Ancient Near East from the dawn of their history.

Human settlements in Caucasian lands go back well into prehistoric times. In those early epochs people were living not only in the larger Trans-Caucasian valley, but also in the northern part of the Great Caucasus. Since no systematic archeological research on a large scale has been done so far, almost all archeological discoveries have been made accidentally. It may well be imagined how rich the yield of systematic archeological research would be in countries whose history is connected with that of the Ancient Near East. Of particular interest are the Bronze Age finds; those of the Trialeti culture in Trans-Caucasia, and in the northwestern part of the Great Caucasus, those of the Maikop area. The objects of major interest are swords and daggers of the Caucasian type, the famous short-sword akinakes (Abkhaz-Cherkess aqama, which designates the present-day kinzhal, also a loan word in Russian), and ornamented standard-tops, usually in the shape of an animal. They exhibit a

172
171

.172 highly developed metal culture and a refined
171 craftsmanship. Typical of the finds of the Maikop area is the representation of animals, often of animals fighting with each other: stags or elks attacked by tigers or leopards, etc. They exhibit a peculiar style or stylization which has led this genre of art to be called the animal style, also the style of animal fight (von Strzygowski); the style seems to have as its center, or at least one of its earliest centers, this part of the Caucasus. In the south of the Maikop area there is found another commonly represented motif, animal standards--representations of animals serving as an ornament on the top of (probably tribal) standards; these can be connected with earlier objects of the Urartu culture around Lake Van, often called Chaldean culture. The animal style is found all over eastern Europe and northern Asia, and is therefore called the Eurasian animal style. It seems to have spread from the Maikop area, or perhaps even from the Chaldean lands on Lake Van, to the middle course of the Kama, west of the Urals; and then to have migrated all across the West Siberian plains to the Altai mountains and the Minusinsk Basin--through which the upper Yenisei streams--north of the Sayan Mountains. There it shows a rich local development which is also typical of the Bronze Age in south-central Siberia. From there it has

172 continued its migration southeastward as far
171 as Noyon (Noyin)-Ola in Mongolia, and finally into northern China. Thus we see a pre-historic cultural connection between the Caucasus and north central Asia and the Far East; this connection took place in the Bronze Age, probably the later Bronze Age, and consisted at least in a cultural transmission over a distance rarely observed during any historical period down to the beginning of the modern
174 age. In mythical and legendary traditions,
101 peoples of the Caucasus were known to the ancient Mesopotamians, the Assyro-Babylonians, and the Hebrews of the Old Testament as the Gimirru or the Gomer. This name survives well into classical antiquity, when there are repeated mentions of the Kimmerioi as living on the northern and northeastern shores of the Black Sea, and after whom the Strait of Kerch and Taman was called the Kimmerian (or Cimmerian) Bosporus. It is quite possible that this same name is found again in that of Crimea. Peoples living in or near the Caucasus were the Togarma and the Gog and Magog of the Old Testament.

174 The lands of the Caucasus in a larger sense remained without any literature or historiography of their own until Christian times, i.e., until the time of their own conversion to Christianity in the 4th and 5th centuries. But before this time they were in the immediate

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RH1 Caucasia RH1

Professor Marr and other linguists who have tried to establish a relationship between the Caucasian languages and the dead languages of Near East were actually attempting the impossible: no one knew (or knows today) what "Proto-Caucasian" might be, and this unknown language was being related to other unknown or little-known languages like Etruscan, Sumerian, Mitani, Elamitic, Lydian, Lycian, Cilician, Carian and Cappodocian.[25] A relationship between Basque and Abkhazian and South Caucasian is quite possible but not yet certain.[26] Similarly, the Burushaski language of Hindu Kush has doubtless many striking features in common with the languages of Daghestan,[27] but to say that these languages originated from a common parent-language is to assume more than has been proved.

Nevertheless these attempts were not totally fruitless. The intense research work carried out especially by the Marr School has brought to light not a few common and mutual influences. Even though we must reject as unfounded the claim of Bork, Winkler, Hüsing, and others that Elamitic is *related* to Caucasian, we cannot deny the strong mutual influence between ancient Georgian and Elamitic. The same holds in regard to Mitani and the language of Urartu: affinity to Georgian may be denied, but the *influences* common to ancient Georgian, Mitani and Urartu may not.

§ 4. PREHISTORY

1. Lower and Middle Paleolithic

There can no longer be any doubt about North and South Caucasus being inhabited since early Paleolithic times, as the prehistoric sites of Yshtakh, Kvemo-Orozmani, Aragas, Odzhendjari and Ilskaya testify. The famous Mt. Yashtukh [illegible] was an accidental discovery made by Zamiatnin in 1934, about three miles [illegible] of the city of Sukhum.[28] These Lower Paleolithic remains include [illegible] worked side-scrapers, points from large flakes, and some fist hatchets [illegible] cm. long and 7 cm. wide). The Yashtukh artifacts are characterized by

[25] Cf. M. Tierney, "Sumerian and Georgian," *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, (1913), [illegible] M. Tierney, "Rassen- und Kulturprobleme des Kaukasus," Heft 1 der Ver[illegible] der deutsch-georgischen Gesellschaft.

[illegible] Bork, "Die Mitanisprache," MVAG XIV (1909), pp. 1—128.

[illegible] *Einführung in das Studium der kaukasischen Sprachen*, p. iv.

[illegible] Winkler, *Die Sprache der dritten Kolonne der dreisprachigen Inschriften und das Altaische*, Berlin, 1896.

C. Hüsing, "Die Sprachen Elams," in *Jahresbericht der Schles. Gesellschaft für Vaterländische Kultur*, Breslau, 1908.

G. Hüsing, *Die einheimischen Quellen zur Geschichte Elams*, Part I, Leipzig, 1916.

G. Hüsing, "Der Zagros und seine Völker," *Der Alte Orient*, VIII (1908), No. 3—4. E. Speiser, *Mesopotamian Origins*, London, 1930.

G. Dumézil, "Langues caucasiennes et basque," *Festschrift für Herman Hirt*, Heidelberg, 1936, Vol. II.

R. Bleichsteiner, "Die Verwandtschaftsbeziehungen des Baskischen," WZKM, 1931.

N. Bouda, *Baskisch-Kaukasische Etymologien*, Heidelberg, 1949.

K. Bouda, "Die wotischkasch-burushaskische Sprache," *Wiener Beiträge zur Kulturgeschichte und Linguistik* I (1930). Cf. also D. L. Lorimer, *The Burushaski Language*, Oslo, 1935.

[28] N. Zamiatnin, "Novyie dannye po paleolitu Zakavkaz'ia," SE, 1935, No. 2.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHI Caucasia RHI

their crude chipping, broad, short, irregular, triangular flakes, and are of the Clactonian and Levalloisian culture level.[29]

Zamjatnin is responsible also for the discovery of the Paleolithic site at Kvurdere near Psyrzkha, likewise in Abkhazia. The remains closely resemble the stone industry of Yashtukh and the Clactonian and Levalloisian types of Northern France, Belgium, and England.[30]

Zamjatnin again discovered a third Paleolithic site, about 50 miles south of Kvurdere, at Ochemchiri, on the coast of the Black Sea. The stone industry resembles that of Ilskaya (N. Caucasus) and is of the Middle Mousterian level.[31]

It is to be noted that these three sites are in Abkhazia, where a considerable number of other Paleolithic artifacts have been discovered. In 1934—35 as many as 15 sites were located in this relatively small area; eight of which are most likely Acheulean and seven Mousterian.[32]

And now, leaving Abkhazia and going north to the Province of Kuban, we find the site of Ilskaya, the very first Paleolithic discovery ever made in the Caucasus. Since Baron de Baye, its discoverer, was unable to make a thorough investigation of the site, other prehistorians later tried to continue the work begun by de Baye. Attempts to rediscover the site by N. J. Krištafovič (1903) and S. A. Krukowski (1916) were complete failures. Nine years later Zamjatnin was successful in locating the site, and then in 1926 and 1928 extensive and systematic excavations were undertaken under the able direction of A. A. Miller.[33] The finds at Ilskaya were very numerous and included typical points, drills, gravers, sidescrapers, and a few artifacts resembling fist hatchets. The Ilskaya remains show fine marginal retouching. The discoveries of 1928 established beyond question that bone also had been used as material for tools. The great variety of form, the one-sided marginal retouching (by pressure as well as by strokes), and the advanced stone technology in general are clear indications that Ilskaya is a highly developed Mousterian station,[34] and like Ochemchiri must be classified as Middle Mousterian. Judging by the large amount of animal remains, Ilskaya must have been an excellent hunting ground.

We have another Middle Mousterian site, in the Aragaz district (Transcaucasia), between Erivan and Leninakan. Here J. de Morgan came across a large number of Obsidian specimens: typical Mousterian points and sidescrapers, small fist hatchets, and discoid nuclei. Heavy marginal retouching characterize these artifacts.[35]

A number of Protolithic discoveries have been made in Crimea: the lower stratum at Kiik-Koba is Pre-Mousterian, while the upper is early Mousterian;

[29] F. Hančar, *Urgeschichte Kaukasiens*, pp. 69—73.

[30] Zamjatnin, *op. cit.*, p. 123.

[31] *ibid.*

[32] Hančar, *op. cit.*, p. 74.

[33] S. N. Zamjatnin, "Station mousterienne à Ilskaya, province de Kouban," *Revue Archeologique*, (Paris), 1929, pp. 282—295. Cf. Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 79—91.

[34] F. Hančar, *op. cit.*, p. 88.

[35] Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 75—78.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHl Caucasia RHl

172 Chokdhura is likewise Early Mousterian, while Shaitan-Kopa (upper and lower) is Late Mousterian.[36]

2. Upper Paleolithic

A considerable number of Upper Paleolithic sites have been discovered in the Caucasus. Without going into detail we shall present a short survey of the Upper Paleolithic in the following table.

TABLE 3

Upper Paleolithic Sites in Caucasia

SITE	CIVILIZATION	DISCOVERER	SOURCES
1. Kheto-Kldi	Early Aurignacian	Krukowski, 1918	Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 138 f.
2. Mgvimevi	Late Aurignacian	Zamiatnin, 1934	Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 139 f.
3. Tsona Kldi	Mousterian-Aurign.	Krukowski, 1918	Hančar, *op. cit.*, p. 139
4. Kudaro I, II, Ukvane, Itaro-Kldi, Kudaro Vindow (cave)	Late Aurignacian	R. R. Schmidt and Kozłowski, 1914	Obermeier, Ebert's Reallexikon, VI, p. 263
5. Gvardzilas-Kldi	Early Capsian	Krukowski, 1916–1917	S. A. Krukowski*
6. Dzudzuana	Late Aurignacian	Nioradze, 1926	G. K. Nioradze**
7. Satsurblia, Sakazia		North Caucasian Expedition, 1926	Lunin,*** Hančar, *op. cit.*, p. 154 f.
8. Starosel'e, Belyi-Kamen' (cave)			Hančar, *op. cit.*, p. 154
9. Shiu-Kldi	Tardenoisian (?)	A. A. Miller, 1925	A. A. Miller†

* S. A. Krukowski, "Peščera Gvardžilas-Kldi v Rioni," *Izv. Kavkaz. Muzeja*, X (1916–1917), Tiflis, pp. 1–[illegible].

** G. K. Nioradze, "Paleolithicum Georgiens," *Tranzactiones*, V, pp. 227–236.

*** V. Lunin, "Arkheologicheskie raskopki i razvedki na Severnom Kavkaze v 1927 g.," *Materialy po arkheologii respubliki*, Rostov, 1928.

† A. A. Miller, "Kratkii otchet o rabotakh Severo-Kavkazskoj ekspedicii Akademii Istorii Material'noj Kul'tury v 1924 i 1925 gg." *Soobshchenia Gosudarstvennaia Akademiia Istorii Material'noi Kultury*, Leningrad, 1926, p. 81. For the above data and further details see Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 138–158.

[36] Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 31–69.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHI Caucasia RHI

It is beyond the least shadow of doubt that Paleolithic food gatherers inhabited the coast of Abkhazia and the regions of Kuban and Rion. The Mousterian people of Caucasia must have been excellent hunters, if we are to judge from the large amount of skeletal remains of wild animals found at the various sites, especially remains of bison, mammoth, wolves, foxes, etc. Hunting was by far more important economically than plant gathering. The horde was the social unit of the Mousterian Caucasians, each horde numbering perhaps 50 to about 100 individuals. The dead were buried with great care and reverence; a heap of flint flakes was usually placed at the side of the corpse, a fact clearly showing that these hunters believed in an hereafter, where they would continue their venatorial life.[37] The Mousterian hunters of the Caucasus belonged to the Neanderthal race and possessed the same material culture, economy, sociology, and ideology as the Crimeans and Neanderthal men of Southern France.[38]

The late Paleolithic period was cold and uncomfortable. Nevertheless, there was still enough plant-life to insure sufficient prey for the hunters. As protection against the cold, men began to seek shelter in caves and grottoes. They were no longer the wandering hunters of old, but lived in semi-permanent dwellings. Their hunting equipment was greatly improved and thus hunting itself was simplified, giving them leisure and plenty of time for art, for not until the Aurignacian do we find signs of ornamentation and rock engravings.[39]

3. Mesolithic (Azilian-Tardenoisian)

With the change of climate, the Azilian-Tardenoisian epoch saw great changes in fauna and flora, and the corresponding changes in economic life. The Azilian Caucasians, however, continued to live in Aurignacian dwellings, the first change in this regard being noticeable only in the Tardenoisian. Microliths and arrow-heads begin to play a very important part. The Azilian-Tardenoisian hunters used bows, harpoons, and lances, but in spite of the improved implements, hunting did not constitute the most important means of livelihood; for, with the disappearance of ice plant-life, larvae, insects, and especially snails abounded, making food gathering more important than hunting.[40] Because the main food was easily available, the dwellings were more or less permanent. The camps, of course, were seasonal. It was during this period that the dog was domesticated, a fact which greatly facilitated the hunting of such animals as the wild pig and deer, and, whenever necessary, the dog was slaughtered and consumed.[41] Among the more important Azilian sites are those of Gvardzhilas-Klde, Shan-Koba, and Syuren II; the more important Tardenoisian sites are those of Kukrek, Kizil-Koba, Upper Shan-Koba, Cherkess-Kermen, and Fatma-Koba.[42]

[37] I. I. Meščaninov, *Vvedenie v jafetiologiju* (Leningrad, 1927), pp. 14 f.
[38] Cf. Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 167 ff., 172, 174, 178.
[39] Cf. Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 185 f.
[40] The importance of snails as food is evidenced by the large amount of shells found in the Tardenoisian stratum of Shan-Koba.
[41] Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 202 f.
[42] For an excellent survey of these finds see Hančar's Tabelle XII, *op. cit.*, p. 197.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RH1 Caucasia RH1

4. The Neolithic Civilization

172 Among the more important Neolithic sites of the Caucasus area are those of Erivan (River Tsanga), Shamiramalti, Nakhichevan, Novorossisk, and *Kurgan I* of Nalchik.[43]

This period saw flourishing vineyards, vegetable gardens, and orchards spring up in southern and western Caucasus. The hunters and food gatherers have become agriculturalists, but unlike the European Neolithic population, they have immediately learned the use of metal. Owing to the proximity of the Caucasians to the great cultural centres, and to the rich deposits of copper in the Mountains, a typical Neolithic without the knowledge of metal has perhaps *never* existed in the Caucasus. Nevertheless, we have here a *true* Neolithic, for the distinguishing feature of the Neolithic is neither metal nor the megaliths, but the economic change from food gathering to food production. Even the vishaps, dolmens, and the Cyclopian constructions, which some falsely classify as Neolithic on account of their Megalithic character, are, doubtless, only pseudo-Neolithic and belong to a more recent period.[44]

The Neolithic inhabitants, it should be noted, were not only agrarians but also animal-breeders, who raised pigs, sheep, cattle, horses, and perhaps donkeys.[45]

Hunting retained much more of its former importance in North Caucasus than it did in Transcaucasia. Most probably the social organization of northern and southern Caucasus was matriarchal.[46]

The Caucasian Neolithic ushers in the abundant use of obsidian, a phenomenon which continues to the time of the Scythian domination over North Caucasus. That obsidian should become such an important material may very well be attributed to various factors: the needs arising from the new economic life, the nature of obsidian itself (its sharp, glassy edges), and the abundance of obsidian in the Caucasus. These obsidian objects are clear evidence of a vigorous agrarian civilization.[47]

5. Copper Age, etc.

Caucasian Copper Age sites are numerous indeed. To mention but a few—there are, for example, the so-called princely burial mounds of Ul, Kostromskaya, Maikop, and Vozdvizhenskaya; then there are the ordinary graves and the numerous finds as those of Privolnoe, Kostromskaya, Dolinskoye, and Staromyshastovskaya.[48]

The sites may be divided into three distinct groups: the Nalchik, the Kuban (Maikop, Novosvobodnaya-Tsarskaya, Vozdvizhenskaya, etc.), and Kuban-Terek group.

[43] Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 211—228.
[44] Hančar, *op. cit.*, p. 212; "Aus der Problematik Urartus," Archiv Orientální XVII (1949), Part I, p. 306.
[45] Hančar, *Urgeschichte Kaukasiens*, p. 238.
[46] For detailed account of the Caucasian Neolithic see Hančar, *op. cit.*, 211—241.
[47] Cf. Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 236 f.
[48] Hančar, *op. cit.*, pp. 242—289.

8: Lužbetak E-4 (no date) 1951 RHI Caucasia RHI

TABLE 4

The Copper Age in North Caucasia*

STAGES	NALCHIK	KUBAN***	KUBAN-TEREK
LOCATION	Nalchik area	Northwestern Caucas.	North Cauc. Foreland
ECONOMY	Hunting (with some primitive hoe culture)**	Cattle-breeding and trade (some hoe culture and perhaps hunting)**	Sheep-, goat-, and horse-breeding, and a highly developed hoe culture**
SOCIETY	Probably matriarchal sibs	Probably matriarchal sibs; however, distinct rise of male importance through leadership in trade, war, and religion	Probably matriarchal sibs with rise of male importance through trade, metallurgy, and cattle-breeding
METALLURGY	First acquaintance with copper (sc., through import)	Import of copper objects; beginning of own copper work	Highly developed local metallurgy
EXTRA-CAUCASIAN RELATIONS		Intensive trade with cultural centres of ancient Near East; sudden cessation of same	Temporary trade relations with the Danube peoples

* Based on Hančar, *op. cit.*, p. 405.

** Non-nomadic.

*** The Kuban finds date from 2400—1900 B. C. See Hančar, "Alâcâ Höyük," *Wiener Beiträge zur Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte Asiens*, XI (1938), pp. 27—35.

The most important Transcaucasian site is that of Tsalka, west of Tiflis, which dates from about 1800—1500 B. C.[49]

The Bronze Age finds are extremely numerous. A "Bronze Age" in the sense in which we find it in other parts of the world cannot be referred to the Caucasus. The Kuban-Terek stage of the Copper Age already had the knowledge of bronze.

The Cimmerian kingdom (c. 1000 B. C.) and the Scythians (700—300 B. C.) now appear on the scene.[50]

[49] Hančar, "Die bemalte Keramik Transkaukasiens im Lichte neuer Funde," *Archiv für Orientforschung*, (Berlin), XIV (1944), No. 5—6, p. 288.

[50] Cf. Hančar, "Die Ausweitung unseres Geschichtsbildes durch die sowjetische Urgeschichtsforschung," *Blick nach Osten*, 1949, No. 1—2, pp. 51—61.
E. H. Minns, *Scythians and Greeks*, Cambridge, 1913.
M. I. Rostovtzeff, *Iranians and Greeks in South Russia*, Oxford, 1922.
Hančar, "Hallstatt-Kaukasus, ein Beitrag zur Klärung des Kimmerierproblems," *Mitteilungen der Österreichischen Gesellschaft für Anthropologie, Ethnologie und Prähistorie*, LXXIII-LXXVII (1947), pp. 152—167.

[825 cont.]

Iranians (cf. p. 674 f. [untranslated]) and accordingly are called by the Tatar āzade khalkh' or khelaiq (= free people), as are all Lezgin, in contrast to the Tāt, who are called raiyat khelaiq (= subject people). Their name is related to that of the central Asian Tajik (see Vol. II, 1, pp. 412 ff.), and their language is close [Fig. 504 appears here] [826] to modern Persian; it is also spoken by the mountain Jews in Dagestan and on the Terek. In their old cemeteries and near their villages there are isolated ruins of buildings that indicate Christianity in former times. Their relatives, the Talysh in humid, hot Lenkoran on the Caspian Sea, surrounded by Azerbaijani and Tatars, speak another variety of modern Persian that is supposed to contain much Old Persian.

563

[172]

As late as the first half of the nineteenth century, a remnant of the Old Persians, adherents of the teachings of Zoroaster or Zerdusht, the Geber, lived on the plain of Surakhane or Ateshga (= fire-land) near Baku, where a temple stood, in which they worshiped the eternal fire fed by a natural gas source. They had moved here from Persia after they had been driven from there and their main temple on the mountain near Yesd destroyed; they gradually

493
231
291

Fig. 504. Two-wheeled carriage, Baku region.